

Planning Commission agenda item on Surplus Property

- Flag for follow up.
- Label: 2 Year - Mailbox (2 years) Expires: Fri 9/23/2022 10:44 AM

DC

Darrell Cozen <mem4321@aol.com>

Wed 9/23/2020 10:44 AM

To: Molinar, Tess



CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Varsh:

Please help me out again and pass this on to the Planning Commissioners.

Thanks again,
Darrell Cozen

Honorable Planning Commission:

Since I wrote on Monday, September 23, on this matter, I have had time to do additional research into the matter of General Plan consistency. Declarations of surplus land need to be consistent with the General Plan, as addressed in page 4 of the staff report.

I have found that the proposal is not consistent with the following policies that were not addressed in the staff report. These inconsistencies are in addition to the ones already addressed in my September 21 letter:

1. Land Use Policy 8.7. *Preservation of Historic Landscapes. Identify, protect, and maintain cultural and natural resources associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.* The open spaces on the west side of Garfield Avenue are historic landscapes by virtue of their significance to the National Register Civic Center historic district.

2. Land Use Policy 10.12. *Urban Open Spaces. Preserve and develop urban open spaces such as landscaped parklets, paseos, courtyards, and community gardens. Ensure adequate public access to these open spaces.* The words, "Preserve....landscaped parklets" definitely seem to relate to this proposal. I am not sure if the City has an adopted definition of "parklets"; but these civic gardens would certainly seem to be excellent examples. They serve as marvelous grassy parcels for picnicking.

3. Green Space, Parks, and Recreation Element Policy 6.8. *Pocket Parks: Identify and acquire land for the establishment of small urban green spaces (pocket parks) in strategic locations within the City. The spaces may be available for all types of uses, depending on the unique qualities of the space, the neighborhood location, and the desires of surrounding residents.* The proposal does not comply with the spirit of this policy. We have possessed something akin to pocket parks across the street from City Hall for over 90 years. Let's preserve them, not call them surplus land.

4. Green Space, Parks, and Recreation Element Policy 7.1. *Urban Open Space Amenities: Encourage the incorporation of publicly accessible urban open spaces, including parks, courtyards, boulevards, water features, gardens, passageways and plazas, into public improvements and private projects.* How can these properties be "surplus" to the City when they are accessible grassy, passive, useful open spaces in the heart of our city? Even if they were not important "grounds and approaches" for City Hall, they would be highly useful in these locations.

5. Open Space Element "issues that need to be addressed" • *Establish more open space in Pasadena. • Create more parks in the Central District.* Rather than specify policies, this element